DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 228 JC 790 180

TITLE General Education Curriculum Issues for the Future in Community and Junior Colleges [Conference]: Proceedings, Issue 2 (Manchester, New Hampshire, October 25-26, 1978).
INSTITUTION New England Junior Coll. Council.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Role; College Curriculum; Community Colleges; *Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Planning; Definitions; Educational Objectives; *General Education; *Junior Colleges; Liberal Arts

ABSTRACT

In October 1978, the New England Junior College Council held their fall conference to consider the future of general education in the community college. This report of the proceedings includes Richard H. Sturgeon's introductory remarks, in which he acknowledged the conference speakers and introduced the question of the survival of the core curriculum. The keynote speaker was Dr. Arthur Cohen who considered the history of general education, its various definitions and its rationale, the integrated general education curriculum at Miami-Dade Community College, and concluded with suggestions for planning a general education curriculum. A summary of John Roeuche's presentation, "General Education is More than Subject Matter," reveals his concerns with effective learning strategies. Franklin Patterson, in his paper entitled "General Education: Shall We Reinvent the Wheel or Find a New Axle?" also sought to define general education and suggested that a core curriculum be organized around method, that is, around conceptualization, explanation, and verification. The proceedings also include the text of a discussion led by Dr. Cohen in response to the question of the different types of general education that must be made available. John C. Hoy, the Executive Director of the New England Board of Higher Education, addressed the issue of the role of the Board in his presentation. (LS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167228

NEW ENGLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE COUNCIL

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard H. Sturgeon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM ISSUES FOR THE FUTURE IN COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

PROCEEDINGS Issue 2

JC 790 180

OCTOBER 25–26, 1978
MANCHESTER, NH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Evening Session:

Introductory Remarks - Richard Sturgeon

Keynote Address - Arthur Cohen

Morning Sessions

Session I John Roueche

Session II Franklin Patterson

Session III Arthur Cohen

Luncheon Address

Introduction Richard Sturgeon

Address John Hoy

Roster of Attendees

Evaluation

NEJCC Executive Committee

NEJCC Program Committee

INTRODUCTION

Twice a year, in the fall and spring, the New England Junior College Council, sponsors a regional conference on topics of interest to community and junior college educators.

In the past few years, conferences have been held on the following topics:

Spring, 1976	Collective Bargaining
Fall, 1976	Innovations in Teaching in New England Community and Junior Colleges
Spring, 1977	Planning, Management and Evaluation Systems in the Community College
Spring, 1978	Institutional Renewal Through Faculty and Staff Development: The Role of Faculty and Administrators
Fall, 1978	General Education Curriculum Issues For The Future in Community and Junior Colleges

In order to share the conference information with members who were unable to attend and to provide a record for those who had attended, printing of conference Proceedings was begun for the Spring 1978 conference.

The session reports contained in the Proceedings represents notes taken by the recorders and are not the complete text of presentations which were made.

I hope you will find the Proceedings to be informative and useful. I welcome your criticisms and comments about the context and format.

November 1978
University of Southern Maine

Richard H. Sturgeon
Editor, Proceedings
Conference Chairman

NEJCC Conference
Manchester, New Hampshire
October 25, 1978

Introductory Remarks

by

Richard H. Sturgeon
Assistant Director, Associate Degree Studies
University of Southern Maine

Evening Session

Good evening. My name is Dick Sturgeon from the University of Southern Maine and I'm serving as conference chairman for this fall's conference.

It's a pleasure to welcome you here this evening as we open what will be, I believe, an outstanding conference. Allow me to introduce the people sitting sith me at our head table. At my immediate left is Marilyn Howe, Associate Professor at Quinsigamond Community College and the Vice President of NEJCC; to her left is Florence Brower Cohen from UCLA and ERIC Clearinghouse; next is Dr. Arthur Cohen, our keynote speaker for this evening; to his left is Dr. Arthur Banks, President of Greater Hartford Community College and the current President of NEJCC; and at the extreme left is Sister Margaret John Kelly, President of Labourne Junior College and the Treasurer of NEJCC. Dr. Charles Kinney, President, Mattatuck Community College and the Secretary of NEJCC and Dr. Franklin Patterson who will be making a presentation during tomorrow's sessions.

I do not want to go any further before acknowledging the excellent assistance provided by the New England Board of Higher Education and particularly its staff associate to NEJCC, Anne Maida. Once the decision on the program topics and speakers have been made, she virtually organizes the remainder of the conference--and very well.

I would like to also recognize the time spent on the planning of the conference by the other members of the program committee:

Bryan Carlson, Mt. Ida Junior College--
Bryan will be chairing the spring conference

George Connick, USM---
My boss and also the Program Committee Chairman

Phil Day, University of Maine at Augusta--
Phil is in charge of the annual meeting in December

Mary Shuster, Rhode Island Junior College

Well, it has surfaced again for inspection by all, ridicule by some, consideration for overhaul by many, and in some circles a possible death. I'm speaking, of course, about the topic for our conference, the issue of General Education or the Core Curriculum.

As I mentioned, some feel it may be a question of survival for General Education at this time. However, in my mind, it is just another of the necessary periods of turmoil which will produce some alterations and a further movement forward toward the ideal.

While teaching me to swim, my father taught me to stay afloat by treading water and I can now float for a long time. The key is to not panic but relax on the surface of the water and to keep your feet moving methodically under the surface. You will not sink and may even move forward. The same advice, I think, is appropriate for those concerned about General Education issues. It has floated successfully for many years and will continue to do so if we don't create a tidal wave of concern.

The task of dealing with the issues before us all is formidable but I anticipate insight and an assist in the proper direction by our distinguished presenters at this conference. The task of sorting out the necessary components of a Core Curriculum with many disciplines clammering for inclusion is much like a college basketball coach attempting to blend the talents of

five superstars into a winning combination without wasting the talent of any one individual. I was a college coach for 15 years and found the task very difficult. Finding the five superstars was my biggest problem so I didn't have much to blend. Maybe that is also one of the problems with creating a realistic Core Curriculum.

General Education, the title, as well as many other things in higher education can be confusing. At a recent college fair on our campus I watched a high school student peruse the flyer and list of courses that make up the Clerical Studies program at a local vocational technical institute. He appeared very confused so the admissions counselor asked if he could help. The student said he was confused because he was interested in the ministry and this Clerical Studies program certainly didn't have the kind of courses he expected.

Friedrich Wilhelm Neitzsche in his statement on "Things the Germans Lack," proclaims that "Dancing in all its forms cannot be excluded from the noble curriculum: dancing with the feet, with ideas, with words, and need I add, one must also be able to dance with the pen."

And now to introduce our keynote speaker, I give you a man who has danced his way through Connecticut and beyond in grand style, Dr. Arthur Banks, our president and President of Greater Hartford Community College.

Keynote Address

"Functional General Education or Irrational Curriculum"

Arthur Cohen, Professor
College of Education
University of California at Los Angeles, California

Recorder: Richard A. Sturgeon

This meeting called on the topic of general education is quite timely. General education is back around once again and I want to speak tonight about what happened to it the first time and also the second time that it was prominent because we need a sense of history if we're going to think about general education. Dr. Brower and I have been doing research for the past four years under National Endowment for the Humanities and National Science Foundation sponsorship to get a fix on the status of the humanities, the sciences, social sciences, and the technologies in the community and junior colleges of America. We now have a comprehensive picture of the liberal arts through studying community colleges. The liberal arts are not exactly general education but there are some very strong connections between the two ideas.

I believe in general education. I want to express to you some of my concerns about it. I have studied it, I have worked with it, and the first book I ever wrote among that long list of books that Mr. Banks mentioned was a book about general education. That's where I started and I'm still at it. I want to express to you what the community college must do for it to be able to claim to be a partner in the whole scheme of higher education. I will mention a couple places that have some interesting current practices in general education, but I won't go into details because we have tomorrow.

This is not a new idea, general education is a concept that has been around for a long time, but the question of what programs community colleges shall offer recurs constantly. How much? In what kind of occupational education? What kind of general education, or what kind of liberal education? What kind of community development education? How far should we go with remedial studies? Must we teach third grade arithmetic? Must we teach spelling? What should we do about basic education? These are issues that just come up all the time whether or not we're interested in curriculum or we sit on the curriculum committee. The community college is not unique in this, our brother the Universities wrestle with these questions, but they are more adept at shirking them because they have a different type of tradition to fall back on. Is there such a thing that everyone should know? Because by definition, general education means that which people should know - in order to function as citizens and family members in the democracy known as the United States.

General education was the classical curriculum of the early 19th century. Classical curriculum was the general education of its time because the definition was that everyone must know the classics in order to function in positions of leadership. It flourished again, however, in the 1920's when general education was based in the survey courses; survey of western civilization, and survey of the arts etc.

It broke up again after World War II, with the insistence that there is so much to know, so much new knowledge that they had to divide the curriculum into little parcels so that everyone had a chance to study his or her own interest. That's really what broke it up. The demise of general education can be traced to the rise of faculty power at the turn of the twentieth century.

The rationale for general education was developed after the fact. The fact is that the faculties were making political accommodations - "we will vote for your department to have a required course in the humanities, and you will vote for our department to have a required course in the sciences; and we will call it a breadth of knowledge - a breadth of understanding." And so we have now the distribution requirement as the main organizing principle for something called general education. In fact it is not, however, I should be careful and I should not deplore that because even that is breaking down and - and in the 1960's we achieved the ultimate in curriculum disintegration when the students challenged our authority to require anything at all and we said ok, take what you want. So we see colleges even now with no requirements - for any degree - stack 'em up - any packaging of any number of credits that will add up to the required number of 60 or 62 in the two-year colleges.

I deplore the idea of a professional educator who says, "I have no authority to tell you what you must know." Yet I go to meetings when people make that statement with much seriousness. The students challenged us in the sixties and we crumbled like broken glass. Now we're getting our nerve back and when we get our nerve back in this profession we take down the book that says general education and we dust it off and we begin talking about it again. The community colleges have followed the university's ideas of distribution requirements. We have in the community and junior colleges academic departments; academic departments fit the idea of the community college like side-saddles fit a hog, like pants fit a horse, like - fill in your own ridiculous extreme. We have followed the universities because there was a burden in the development of the community and junior colleges in this

country where the most important thing to say was, "we are as good as they". We have faculty with doctorate degrees. They have faculty with doctorate degrees. We have academic departments just as they do. We have courses just as they do. We're past that time now. We don't have to apologize any more. We don't have to tie our tail to the university's kite. There are a great number of people in community colleges who still see that the most prestigious thing they could do is to be as much like the university as possible. If you wait for the universities to show the way in general education and then follow what they do, you are not going to make it.

Florida, (I am, by the way, from Florida originally) has had, for 20 years, a ruling that the universities would accept transfers from two-year colleges and they would accept the transfer as having fulfilled his general education requirement in any way that the community college said he did. The community colleges, therefore, were free to develop the type of general education that they felt was most useful. Miami-Dade Community College has developed an integrated humanities course. In the 1960's they had it and they hired instructors specifically to teach it. However, that course pulled itself apart because the instructors began segmenting it into 6 weeks of art, 6 weeks of philosophy, 6 weeks of music, 6 weeks of literature, and so on. Now they're back around with it again and they have developed a very fine integrated humanities course.

Talking about general education in terms of it being "that which everyone should know" is quite a difficult approach, but recently our commissioner of education, Ernie Boyer, has argued for "that which shall be taught to all students." Isn't it nice to have a commissioner of education who speaks about a common core and "that which everyone should know" as opposed to his predecessor who would talk of career education and study skills.

General education has also been commpared with liberal education, "that which is supposed to free people", and there is a good justification for that definition of general education. One of the problems with general education, however, is that it has been defined as "that which it is not". I will quote for you just one of those types of definitions that appeared in 1976. "At the operational level general education is not special, that is, it is not designed for specific groups of people or special activities, it is not an introduction to disciplines that are first step in specialization, it is not the development of skills or the acquisition of knowledge precisely for their applicability to a job, a career or another specialization, it is not a collection of courses, it is not simply a rearrangement of content like an interdisciplinary program of courses for the sake of being interdisciplinary, it is not so abstract or future oriented that it can be only hoped for, wished for, or soon to happen somewhere sometime, it is not merely being able to read, to write, and to do arithmetic." That's the definition. Given that definition by exclusion, general education as an idea becomes prey to any group with an idea of what should be taught and so the academic discipline which has its hold on the faculty, because they were all trained in disciplinary programs, becomes the only organizing principle around which a faculty person can think about instruction.

Sometimes the definition is too broad. It may say "a student must understand his cultural heritage and have a sense of values and be a responsible citizen and appreciate democracy" and use a lot of that type of language, and then who can say that your specialized course in Elizabethian Literature does not do some of that? So when we hang on a definition that is so broad, any specialized course fits within it. The term terminal general education was in use in the 1930's, because general education was the place where you

dumped people who did not have the drive to enter a specialized program and the general colleges were formed to serve as dumping grounds and were founded on some idea of general education.

In some states recent rulings have said that the community colleges are not only responsible for doing the adult basic education but also for teaching certified mentally deficient; that is the handicapped or retarded, giving a new challenge to the idea of general education. It was bad enough when they hung us with providing occupational training and now when we're saddled with adult basic education. The Community Colleges are not blessed with strong educational leadership, with people who get articulate curriculum ideas. I sat at a meeting last March with many chancellors and presidents of community colleges from the West and Midwest, and I talked about ideas of general education. It went over like a wave. I realized they were sitting there acting like apartment house managers who are concerned about keeping the plumbing operating, and making sure the roof doesn't leak, and we were there asking them to be concerned about the quality of the music to which their tenants were listening, and they were saying in every way they could - including silence - why are you bothering me? We cannot look for educational leadership or curriculum leadership from the chancellors and presidents as a group. I'm excluding a few individuals and I could name them, but as a group, they tend not to be concerned with curriculum. Similarly, the faculty are somewhat less than concerned with curriculum, as a group.

Institutions do not operate with a clear cut definition of general education. I can define education for you as the process of learning. I can define curriculum for you as a set of courses. I can define instruction as a series of events organized deliberately so that learning occurs. There's

nothing archaic about it, but the whole idea of education, curriculum, and instruction is in jeopardy in the community colleges.

If you can accept a more strict definition of education, curriculum and instruction, you can get very quickly to general education as an art - because people who study a subject are more likely to learn it than people who do not study it. People who study something longer are more knowledgeable of it than people who study for less time. People who take courses in which the relationship among ideas are explicated are more likely to understand those relationships than people who take narrow specialized, fractionalized, disintegrated courses. All of these premises flowed from the definitions of education, curriculum and instruction. They are deceptively simplistic and they seem obvious. I'm sure I would not get too much of an argument in this room about the definitions or about the premises that stem from them. Then why are we going into experiential learning? Then why are we going into open circuit television with no attempt to assess whether anyone has learned anything from the presentation? What are the other types of experiences that are being built in our equalized institutions? The idea that everyone should select their own goals, select their own media, access their own learning, all of these kinds of ideas are anti-curricular, anti-educational; hence, anti-general education.

You could make a good case for general education in the community colleges. The simplest way is to say that if the associate degree is to maintain its legitimacy in the eyes of the public it must have the general education component and you can challenge me on that one tomorrow.

On what basis should community colleges plan curriculum? I've already mentioned the educator. First, I would suggest that programs activities be measured against the criteria of education. Is an activity verified as

education? Is it designed so somebody who did not know something when they started will know it when they are through?

Second, I think that curriculum should be planned on the dimension of social utility as opposed to the idea of individual interest or individual wishes.

Third, I would suggest that the community colleges should teach that which is not readily available elsewhere to the clients that they serve, and here I am putting adult basic studies in a lower court. We can say general education is the process of developing the framework on which to place knowledge stemming from values, sources of learning to think critically, develop values, understand traditions, respect diverse cultures. We can talk about is purpose being to assist people who are shining their own vestibule. I reject the idea of separate sets of distribution requirements as passing for general education.

I will leave you with the mention of the general education plan that has been developed in one of the California institutions, that is based on the idea of integration of knowledge, and also on the idea that every matriculated student at that institution must take these courses. This is a college that is using specified courses in each of six areas; communication, social, biological, physical sciences, language arts, humanities. Six courses that everyone gets, plus two courses that build such things as ethical values or economic growth or equality and justice. So they have accepted the disciplines integrated into the behavioral sciences, social sciences, etc., and allows the faculty to do one course that qualifies as a general education course and then they have two courses that cut across and are based on broad social themes. The plan is notable, less for its content than for

the way it was organized. The college is organized by divisions, not departments, that's essential. Each division is led by a Dean. The person who is the Dean of Humanities knows that he is responsible to do the humanities in the integrated fashion if it is to maintain the general education plan. I mentioned that each course is required for all matriculated students, there are no exceptions. They have done it and the college draws its student population predominantly from the low socio-economic status community. It's not any specialized clientele.

I would ask you, tomorrow to discuss ideas with me such as the different types of general education that must be available for the traditional 18 year old out of high school student as opposed to the casual drop-in adult. There needs to be a general education for both. I will talk with you about the rationale for general education being the type of freedom that says "I can understand the arguments from experts who talk to me about issues of the environment etc. ..." That's important and each one has to make those decisions. People need to understand how things work, social systems, persuaders, artists computers. General education is for the idea of a full citizen, it has great social value and I'm optimistic about its future. I have seen it work. I see it as an idea now, that has come back around for the third time in the history of American Higher Education. I see the Community Colleges as essentially holding to that idea for no other reason than they've got no place else to go. You're not going to make it doing basic studies or education of the mentally deficient. That's one of the social values that someone has to do, but you've got to maintain your soul, your integrity, your credibility as an institution of post-secondary education.

I think we've gone to the bottom when we're dealing with a core of part-time instructors as many colleges are. They have 3 part-time instructors for

every full-time instructor, and say, "this is our faculty"; people who don't care about curriculum, who don't know what the word means. General education in a curriculum plan demands a faculty that understands what they're doing. I think that we must work for leadership for a general education plan and it should come from a dean or a division chairperson, depending on how the institution is organized. That person is the director of the general education plan at that institution. It's too important an idea to be left to people who don't understand curriculum or don't care about it.

I think general education should be organized at the campus level. It's too important to be given to a district level and multi-campus district or to a state. The colleges must provide a general education and they must devise a way of doing it.

I'm promoting a general education plan. I believe in it strongly. It is the one curriculum idea that I have spent my entire professional life on, and I doubt that I will be dissuaded. Thank you very much.

Session I "General Education Is More Than Subject Matter"

Presentor: John Roueche
Director of Community College Education Programs
University of Texas at Austin

Recorder: Robert Lemelin
Associate Degree Studies
University of Southern Maine
Portland, Maine

John Roueche began his presentation by pointing out that the heavy emphasis on cognitive learning may often be misplaced. He noted that recent studies show that memory and cognitive learning have little impact on the learner and that 90% of cognitive learning is gone in six months. What does matter for Professor Roueche is the affective domain of learning.

As he developed his points and answered questions, Professor Roueche placed the burden of learning on the use of affective learning strategies by teachers. He emphasized that teachers don't observe the behavior of their students closely enough. Student responses to teaching go unanalyzed too frequently. Roueche's concern is not how you build content but how you implement affective values in a learning situation.

The teacher's interest should focus on facilitating student growth and helping students to become more self-directed in changing their lives and learning. At the heart of all learning situations that are effective is a learner who learns things of interest and value to him. The difference between a student and a learner is that the student learns things of value and interest to the teacher, whereas the learner learns things of value and interest to himself. To be effective the teacher (or learning facilitator) must turn students into learners.

Professor Roueche maintains that feelings drive behavior and help us to predict behavior. Teachers must first consider how they themselves learn best. Once one looks at oneself as a learner, one can understand the student as a learner. The

teacher must start where the student is, that is, the reality of his world of interests and values. Attention to this affective domain reaps the best cognitive rewards in teaching. Therefore, teachers must pay close attention to student behavior. The teacher must observe where students sit in the classroom, whether they have pencils and paper, whether they take notes, whether they make eye contact with the teacher, whether they feel free to disagree with the teacher, whether they initiate questions, and whether they are sorry when a class ends. The teacher must convince the student that his learning has meaning and value in his life.

The genius of teaching is getting students excited about learning. Teachers must be helped not exhorted to get students involved in learning situations. The role of the administrator is to indicate that he values what is done well in the classroom, to meet with divisions and discuss teaching problems, and to listen. Ph.D. training is antithetical to the broad needs of the community college; more breadth and less depth is needed. One must know one's content but one must also let students know that you care about their learning. No one wants to be an ineffective teacher.

Session II

"General Education: Shall We Reinvent the Wheel of Find a New Axle"?

Presenter: Franklin Patterson
Frank L. Boydon, Professor
University of Massachusetts

Recorder: George P. Connick, Director
Associate Degree Studies
University of Southern Maine
Portland, Maine

In 1947, the President's Commission on Higher Education attempted to clarify the meaning of general education in its final report. The report said that general education was a common set of learning experiences which all educated men and women should have aside from whatever vocational or specific professional education they might pursue. The final report was not all that clear, however, about exactly what is meant by "a common set of learning experiences." It said that there was a great deal of diversity in American higher education and that there would be many different interpretations of what is meant by common learning experiences. And indeed, that is how it has turned out.

Since 1974, higher education has wrestled with the definition of the wheel of general education and reached several definitions. One is essentially a non-definition by allowing free electives. Another emphasizes a distribution system which allows students to take courses from a number of different areas. Still another emphasizes the "great books" approach which rigidly defines the subject matter everyone will learn. But not one of these ways of defining a wheel really seems to say something that everybody could be satisfied with at a specific point in time.

In the last 25 years we have reached a degree of agreement about what ought to be included in general education. In broad terms, most educators believe that general education should include samplings from the following areas: social sciences, humanities, natural sciences and mathematics, and communications. What we don't have agreement on is how to make the general education experience vital and feasible on a lasting basis and not simply a chaotic, divided sort of thing. The search for the past forty years has been for an integrated concept that will give stability and direction to the curriculum in general education. The feeling is that we can decide what in these other fields really are the essentials and then agree on those and teach them and that will give general education broad acceptance. In fact, this is what Harvard is seeking to do in its new approach.

There is no question that it is difficult to define general education in a period when knowledge is exploding, when we are swamped with information and knowledge in every field. The doctrine of common knowledge has not been too useful for most of us who are confronted by rapidly expanding knowledge.

There are several other ways we might approach the issue of general education. One idea would organize general education around the theme of citizenship education. The central thread would be a curriculum which prepares a student for citizenship with all of its ramifications. Another possibility would be to organize general education around the concept of values. But both of these notions have difficulties associated with them because it is difficult to determine how to define citizenship or to determine whose values will be taught. Another possibility would organize general education around the notion of critical thinking. This would emphasize the process of learning rather than the content, as in the case of values.

For me, none of these approaches will provide an axle for general education. Therefore, I would like to propose the following: Organize general education around method. In this sense, we would be true to the concept of critical thinking as the central organizing principal of general education. Method would be concerned with conceptualization, explanation, and verification. Most important would be learning how to read and communicate effectively, how to conceptualize and how to understand.

Jerome Bruner in his presidential address to the American Psychological Association some years ago describes how this kind of approach to curriculum could be developed around three commanding questions. These questions are as appropriate for an eight year old as they are for an eighteen year old or a fifty-eight year old. These questions are important because they are interesting and because they intersect the notions of conceptualization, explanation and verification. The questions are: What is human about human things?, How did people become human?, and How can human beings become more human?.

The remainder of the session was devoted to a discussion of this concept of general education and a discussion of examples.

Session III "Is General Education For Everyone?"

Presentor: Arthur Cohen, Professor
College of Education, UCLA
Director of ERIC Clearinghouse
for Junior Colleges

Recorder: Nancy Schuster
Department of English
Rhode Island Junior College, Rhode Island

Dr. Cohen's workshop sessions were held by having an informal question and answer format based upon his address given at the banquet. This report will focus on some of the dialogue that occurred.

Question: Is general education for everyone?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How much general education in a 60 hour program?

Answer: A minimum of twelve hours or four courses ranging up to twenty-four hours.

Question: What criteria should exist for materials in those courses?

Answer: That which broadens the individual's outlet. The curriculum itself becomes the organizer.

Question: How does it differ from a multi-disciplinary approach?

Answer: It can be labeled that.

Question: How can one help the faculty to become general education teachers?

Answer: Start with a small number who are ready. It is important to start small. Have the faculty build their materials, devise media, even write their own texts. You don't need the faculty collectively, only just a few.

Question: How does remedial education fit in?

Answer: Don't segregate the functionally illiterate. In a sense all education is remedial. I don't know what remedial education means--it still is education.

Question: What about the Basic Skills?

Answer: Note the program at Miami-Dade. They have an integrated program in their humanities course.

Question: What about students in the occupational areas?

Answer: You need one instructor who understands his discipline. He must get out there and actually go to the occupational area.

Question: What about student resistance to general education?

Answer: Get the thing built first then worry later. Require the course after it has demonstrated its value. Construct an integrated inter-disciplinary core of courses required for all.

Thursday, October 26, 1978

Introduction by

Richard H. Sturgeon
University of Southern Maine
Conference Chairman

Luncheon

I hope you are finding the conference as informative and stimulating as I am. I want to remind you that we will be publishing the proceedings of the conference and you will be able to have material on any of the sessions you have missed.

I encourage you to join with our presenters for the panel/dialogue session at 1:30 p.m. There will be an attempt to summarize the earlier discussions and an opportunity for questions. I promise that we will end on time so you can leave on schedule.

A reminder that the annual meeting of NEJCC will be held in Boston on December 7, a Thursday, at the Copley Plaza. Phil Day is responsible for organizing the discussion and the topic is "The Implication of Proposition 13 for Higher Education." An appropriate speaker will be scheduled so that we may be better informed about the impending disaster facing us all.

I understand that when Mohammed Ali met in Russia recently the most pressing question asked of him by the Premier was about Proposition 13. The Russian Premier wanted to know about this new secret weapon the U.S. now has--one that eliminates people but saves buildings.

The lunch hour is short so I will move right on to introducing John Hoy, the new Executive Director of NEBHE, for some brief remarks.

John Hoy returned to New England this year from California after an absence of nine years. His early education was at Wesleyan University in American Civilization and he later studied at both the University of

Pennsylvania and the University of Chicago concentrating in the area of higher education--most recently as Vice Chancellor for University and Student Affairs at University of California at Irvine since 1969. Previously he has been Dean of Special Academic Affairs, Dean of Admissions and Assistant to the President at Wesleyan University. He also served as Dean of Admissions at Swarthmore College.

John has authored two books--Choosing a College and The Effective President--he has contributed numerous articles to professional journals and publications such as the Saturday Review of Literature, Christian Science Monitor, The College Board Review and the Educational Record. He has also served on the College Entrance Examination Board, Commission on Tests and as a consultant to the Ford, Rockefeller and Sloan Foundations and to the United States Senate.

I've found John Hoy a quiet man, but one who quickly exhibits a sharp mind, good organization and excellent knowledge of higher education issues. I now present to you--John Hoy.

LUNCHEON ADDRESS

by

John C. Hoy

Executive Director
New England Board of Higher Education

Recorder: Richard H. Sturgeon

Dick gave me considerable freedom in the comments that I could make today, and I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to try and describe to you what I think the agenda for the NEBHE ought to be. I do that in the hope that you will indeed respond to these comments. The Board, as I think most of you are aware, is a kind of unique entity in New England. It was created by reason of six acts of the several New England Legislatures. The then governors who included community college graduate Ribicoff, Edmund Muskie, Christian Herter and others, signed that legislation and the compact itself was permitted through an act of congress.

Ken Harrington at the first meeting of the Commission on Reorganization of Higher Education in Massachusetts (which appears at this point to be in some trouble) commented to that group that he felt that New England had no Natural Resources - he felt that New England Industrial base had basically fled, that the economy of this region was in profound difficulty and that if New England had anything on which to build its future and turn around the condition of its economic development it was essentially its wit, its intelligence, and its tech-

nical capabilities. He felt that there was a tremendous disjunction between this diverse and rich educational system and the economic realities of New England life and that somehow this primary resource of the region had to be brought to the service of this economy and that the economy itself had to acknowledge that it was so fully dependent upon a higher education community.

It seems to me that higher education currently suffers from a residue of platitudenous statements about itself. That we've enjoyed two decades of unprecedented growth, that we have participated in probably the growth of industry of our economy and that has come to an end. I think our faculties, to a remarkable degree have been brought up during the period where the anticipation was that everyone loved higher education, understood it, believed in it, saw it as a way out. That era is over. We have a few more years to adjust to that gloomy fact because while we talk about decline in enrollment, this will probably not hit us very hard for another three to five years and then in earnest. I think we're in for a very, very rough time.

One of the remarkable things about the New England Board is the fact that our board is comprised of delegations from states and included in the delegations are representatives and senators from the Houses of the several Legislatures, public sector members, especially business people, Community College Presidents, independent college presidents, State University Presidents and chancellors. I think the Board as an organization really does try to pull together in one place a regional perspective on private sector and governmental legislative concerns. I think the Board should, on a regional basis, exercise that form with a deep sense of integrity and avoid the phenomenon that I think we all have engaged in too much which is essentially the gilding of the (lily) of those issues confronting higher education.

One of the things that pleases me very much about this association is that you are the only association in New England that attempts to bring together from six states public and private community college people. Obviously, that, from time to time, is an unholy alliance, and you must feel on certain occasions that you'd be far better off to go out and talk separately in circles rather than together. Yet there is, I think, a possibility in New England; and I have observed it, as you have, of the Higher Education Community squaring off against itself. Statements in the public sector quarreling over resources or priorities - or indeed the private and public sector exacerbating in debate. If that occurs, and I think I say this with considerable authority, the spectacle of higher education engaging in that kind of backbiting and competition will be thoroughly enjoyed by the legislators - and I think will be indeed the kind of public response it deserves. The press would have a field day and has already had in a few instances, and I think we are at a crucial point in our relationships with one another where (forums) such as this and those that indeed may be broader have to elicit a new level of candor - a new level of openness with respect for our concerns but in a sense a new definition of commonwealth of concern for the common good. In New England, I would presume to say that higher education is not the primary factor in the New England Economy. It certainly is second or third. In essence, our relationship to the economic well-being of this region is something that we had not fully articulated or explained, and further, I don't think we understand it. I doubt that there are a handful of University presidents, college presidents, community college presidents, who have at their fingertips the economic impact of their institution on the economy that they reside in and essentially supports them as well.

For some of the reasons that I've outlined, the Board has endorsed several priorities which I would like to quickly outline for you, realizing the outline

is quite superficial. First we remain deeply concerned with respect to access to higher education. New England has done well in the course of the last 20 years. Indeed, in some respects it is a leadership section of the country with respect to access to higher education. Yet, the issue of minority enrollment, low income enrollment, the transition from high school to college, in many of the states the issue of handicapped students, the issue of older adults, the issue of women, have been addressed. In Maine for example, which all of those of you who are from the state of Maine are fully aware, the state sends a smaller proportion of high school graduates on to some form of higher education than any state in the Union including Alabama and Mississippi. Vermont and New Hampshire are not far behind. We have a lot to do on that front and the Board is committed to working principally through the provision of accurate information with respect to our progress in that department. The second priority is essentially, to try and be a place where a regional data base or a regional source of information with respect to higher education can be fully relied upon where you can turn to get comparative data. Our concern in this regard is not to establish yet another higher education institute or repository fresh survey research - but rather to pull together the monstrous amount of data that is available and make sense of it, to package it, in order that busy legislators and busy presidents and people of the private sectors can at least get a sense of important trends related to higher education in the region. To my knowledge it is not done anywhere. We recently negotiated, I think, what ought to be an extraordinary relationship with the New England Regional Office of the College Board, in order that all their data on a regional basis will be available to us and our approaches available to them. The third dimension of what we hope to do is the creation of, at the October Board meeting, a unit within the New England Board called The Management Research Institute. Our hope is to put together under a management research institute sponsored by the Board, a series

level of attentiveness that governors and legislators and people from business provide for me. When you attempt to address the regional issues confronting higher education as part of New England, it's as bound up with New Englanders as Waldon Pond, and I think many of us have not celebrated the fact that when you really talk about general education or liberal education there is no section of the world that has a richer mix - a profound mix of the liberal arts pulled into the absolute fabric of these six states, no such thing as this in California. Their liberal arts are somehow a voice of the wilderness and they do prevail, in their own way, but there is something unique about New Englanders in this regard; and I have been very impressed at the degree in which people in business perhaps understand that fact better than we do. They are not pressing us to ever increasingly narrow the dimensions of vocational training, and I would hope, that with your help and your participation in a number of these programs, particularly the role of the junior colleges and community colleges in New England will be not only voiced but they will gather some strength from those activities that the Board is and will be engaged in.

Thank you.

NEW ENGLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE COUNCIL

FALL CONFERENCE

October 25-26, 1978
Manchester, New Hampshire

ROSTER OF ATTENDEES

ATCHESON, Raymond W., Dean of the College, Northwestern Connecticut Community College

BANKS, Arthur C., Jr., President, Greater Hartford Community College, Connecticut; President, NEJCC

BARTOW, Dennis S., Dean of Academic Affairs, Quincy Junior College, Massachusetts

BURGESS, Antoinette L., General Studies Coordinator, Springfield Technical Community College, Massachusetts

CARLSON, Bryan E., President, Mount Ida Junior College, Massachusetts

COHEN, Arthur M., Professor, University of California at Los Angeles

CONNICK, George P., Director, Associate Degree Studies, University of Southern Maine; Program Chairman, NEJCC

CONNORS, Philip I., Academic Dean, Central New England College, Massachusetts

DANFORTH, Charles D., Chairman, Division of Arts & Humanities, University of Maine at Augusta

DARNOWSKI, Vincent, President, Housatonic Community College, Connecticut

DelPRETE, Alberta, Reading Academy Curriculum Coordinator, Bristol Community College, Massachusetts

DIMITRY, John R., President, Northern Essex Community College, Massachusetts

DUNBAR, Shirley, Bunker Hill Community College, Massachusetts

EPSTEIN, Marsha, Instructor, Social Science, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

EPSTEIN, Martin, Division Chairperson, Social Science, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

FORESI, Joseph, Jr., Dean of Academic Affairs, South Central Community College, Connecticut

FRENCH, Paulette, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Southern Maine

FRENIERE, Emil, Chairman, Humanities, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

FULTON, Ruth C., Academic Dean, Andover College, Maine

GALLOWAY, John D., Professor of Science, Endicott College, Massachusetts

GARTLAND, Barbara, Acting Academic Unit Leader, Behavioral Sciences, Cuyahoga Community College, Ohio

GERMAN, Kathe, Division Chairman, North Shore Community College, Massachusetts

GOMES, Terrence, Assistant Dean of Faculty, Roxbury Community College, Massachusetts

GOODWIN, Nancy L., President, Greenfield Community College, Massachusetts

GRIFFIN, Joseph, Dean of the College, Unity College, Maine

HALEY, Arthur F., President, Mount Wachusett Community College, Massachusetts

HARVEY, David W., Dean of the College, Mitchell College, Connecticut

HECHT, Alfred R., Assistant Dean, Curriculum Development, Moraine Valley Community College, Illinois

HONEGGER, Otto L., Professor, Political Science, Division Chairman, Social Science, Russell Sage Junior College of Albany, New York

HOWE, Marilyn, Associate Professor, Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts; Vice President, NEJCC

HOY, John C., Executive Director, New England Board of Higher Education

HUTCHINSON, William A., Chairman, Division of Biological Sciences, Holyoke Community College, Massachusetts

JAUREGUI, Ignacio, Dean of the College, Mount Ida Junior College, Massachusetts

KELLY, Sister Margaret John, President, Laboure Junior College, Massachusetts; Treasurer, NEJCC

KINNEY, Charles B., President, Mattatuck Community College, Connecticut, Secretary, NEJCC

KLEBE, Sharon A., Dean, University College, University of Bridgeport, Connecticut

KNOWLTON, Leah, Professor of English, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

KOLAR, Otto M., Associate Dean, School of the University Transfer Studies, Triton College, Illinois

KRESHPANE, Harry L., Dean of Academic Affairs, Dean Junior College, Massachusetts

LARSON, Charles E., Chairman, Physical Education & Recreation, Cape Cod Community College, Massachusetts

LAYDEN, Robert, Professor of English, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

LEADEM, James A., Director of Counseling Services, St. Anselm's College, New Hampshire

LEMELIN, Robert, Coordinator, Ads Writing Programs, University of Southern Maine

MacDONALD, Elinor, Reading Instructor, Quinebaug Valley Community College, Connecticut

MAIDA, Anne M., Staff Associate, New England Board of Higher Education and New England Junior College Council

MALONEY, Clark, Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts

MARKIEWICZ, Walter J., Executive Dean, Greater Hartford Community College, Connecticut

MARTIN, Marilyn, Instructor, Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts

McKENZIE, John F., President, Massachusetts Bay Community College

McNAMARA, Paul S., Associate Dean for Management & Planning, Housatonic Community College, Connecticut

MERSFELDER, John L., Academic Dean, Endicott College, Massachusetts

MESSNER, William F., Dean of the College, Keystone Junior College, Pennsylvania

MICHALOWSKI, Elizabeth, Mattatuck Community College, Connecticut

MILLER, Robert E., President, Quinebaug Valley Community College, Connecticut

MITCHELL, Kent, Professor of English, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

MORENO, Angel Amy, Professor of Social Science, Roxbury Community College, Massachusetts

MORGAN, Sister Mary Louise, President, Aquinas Junior College, Massachusetts

MOTTA, Janice, Director of Reading Academy, Bristol Community College, Massachusetts

O'NEILL, Maureen, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Endicott College, Massachusetts

OWENS, Jerry, Assistant Dean, School of the University Transfer Studies, Triton College, Illinois

PATTERSON, Franklin, Frank L. Boydon, Professor, University of Massachusetts; Past President, Hampshire College

PEREGON, Michael, Instructor, Social Science, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

PIOTROWSKI, Thaddeus, Associate Professor, Sociology, Merrimack Valley College, New Hampshire

POSNANSKY, Dan, Associate Director for Information Services, New England Board of Higher Education

POTTER, Susan E., Associate Professor of Mathematics, Rhode Island Junior College

O'NEILL, Samuel J., Dean of Academic Affairs, Mount Wachusett Community College, Massachusetts

PLUNKETT, J. Terry, Professor of English, University of Maine at Augusta

REED, Karen, Secretary, New England Board of Higher Education

RICE, James, Associate Professor, Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts

ROUECHE, John E., Director, Community College Education Programs, University of Texas at Austin

SCHMIDT, Alesandra, Academic Dean, Pine Manor College, Massachusetts

SELF, Mary Anne, Professor of Biology, Bunker Hill Community College, Massachusetts

SHEA, Ray, Professor of English, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

SHUSTER, Nancy, Associate Professor of English, Rhode Island Junior College

SOUSA, George, Instructor, Social Science, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts

STEVENS, Lucina, Instructor of Music, Rhode Island Junior College

STURGEON, Richard H., Associate Director, Associate Degree Studies, University of Southern Maine; Conference Chairman, NEJCC

THAYER, Gretchen, Professor, Early Childhood Education, Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts

THOMAS, Susan C., Project Director, American Experiment, Education Development Center, Inc., Massachusetts

TRAUB, Lois, Coordinator of State Delegation Affairs, New England Board of Higher Education

VAN BUSKIRK, Lloyd H., President, Becker Junior College, Massachusetts

WATSON, Margaret, Dean of Academic Affairs, Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts

WHELAN, Joseph F., Assistant Professor of English, Vermont Technical College

WYNTJES, Sherrin, Chairperson, Liberal Arts Division, Mount Ida Junior College, Massachusetts

YOUNG, William D., Dean of the College, Cape Cod Community College, Massachusetts

Late Registrants

ASHURST, Margaret, 61 Worcester Street, Boston, MA

SELLERS, Usha, Northern Essex Community College, Massachusetts

SISTER PHILOMENE, President, Aquinas Junior College, Massachusetts

DUNPHEY, Paul, Asst. to the President, Mt. Ida Jr. College, Massachusetts

MCGOWAN, Joan, Bunker Hill Community College, Massachusetts

NEJCC

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

Fall Conference, 1978
Manchester, NH

	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
1. Pre-conference publicity and information	9	23	10	10
2. Conference registration (efficiency and friendliness of the staff)		3	18	31
3. Housing arrangements (if applicable)	2	3	8	18
4. Food services (if applicable)		9	5	15
5. Meeting room facilities, comfort, acoustics, etc.		10	29	13
6. Supporting materials, handouts, visual, etc.	5	22	20	4
7. Quality of the presentations		8	27	15
8. Adherence of the program to its publicized content		10	24	18
9. Relevancy of what was presented to what you wanted	1	16	18	15
10. Overall organization of the program		4	29	18
11. Your overall rating of the conference/activity as compared to others you have attended		8	30	12

	Too Short	About Right	Too Long	
12. Length of the entire program	5	44		
13. Length of the individual sessions		44		

	None	Little	Enough	
14. Opportunity to have your questions answered		3	46	

	Yes	No
15. Knowing what you do now, would you have come to this conference if given the choice again?	42	5

16. What do you feel was missing from the conference (if anything)?

See next page

16. What do you feel was missing from the conference (if anything)?

A little more time for discussion with speakers.

More substance from the part of some of the speakers. It's better to have a lecture/discussion activity than an informal "yes" or "no"!

Too much theory, not enough hands on specifics - concrete strategies

Free bar! Greater chance to meet colleagues and discuss what others are doing, and the application of what they learned at the conference. Should have had a concluding or post-conference cocktail hour! - increased registration fee to cover it. How about an hour's session which is not structured and not led by an expert? Would give us a chance to rap freely. I've disliked the long introductions and the self-congratulatory baloney from the mike in past sessions, especially Cape Cod two autumns ago. This session avoided all of that. You could work to reduce introductions and talk about the board and organization even further. Same for the speakers. Get right into the content, and cut the dead listening time.

Well done!

Would like more pre-outline materials of meetings and would like a number of recommended publications to be available here.

Women presenters!

More "nuts & bolts" reconstruction of core-curriculum - perhaps several models could have been introduced for study and discussion.

In workshop environment, a chance to exchange ideas with the other participants. More illustrative materials - examples of general ed. courses, curriculum, video of classes in session etc.

Breakdown - workshops to interrelate experiences.

Practical info - organizational development - how to implement goals of gen-ed.

Generally good - wish speakers, particularly Cohen, had been more specific on positions re gen-ed. Too much amount of time allocated to what it isn't.

Structure was good. One of the day sessions I attended lacked structure, relying too much on questions. However, John Roueche was excellent. I know he knows that - but it's worth reaffirming.

Integrative lucheon focus.

A supplementary list of late comers to the conference.

NEJCC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Arthur C. Banks, Jr.
President,
Greater Hartford Community College
Hartford, CT 06106

Charles B. Kinney
President
Mattatuck Community College
Waterbury, CT 06708

George P. Connick
Director of Associate Degree
Studies
University of Southern Maine
Portland, ME 04103

Philip Day
Director of Academic Planning and
Institutional Research
University of Maine at Augusta
Augusta, ME 04330

Marilyn Howe
Associate Professor
Quinsigamond Community College
Worcester, MA 01605

Arthur F. Haley
President
Mount Wachusett Community College
Gardner, MA 01440

Bryan E. Carlson
President
Mt. Ida Junior College
Newton Center, MA 02159

Sister Margaret John Kelly
President
Laboure Junior College
Boston, MA 02124

Robert A. Silvestre
Dean of Arts and Sciences
Rhode Island Junior College
Warwick, RI 02886

John F. McKenzie
President, Massachusetts Bay
Community College
Wellesley, MA 02181

NEJCC PROGRAM COMMITTEE

George P. Connick
Director
Associate Degree Studies
University of Southern Maine
Portland, ME 04103

Bryan Carlson
President
Mt. Ida Junior College
Newton Center, MA 02159

Philip Day
Director of Academic Planning
& Institutional Research
University of Maine at Augusta
Augusta, ME 04330

Norman Landry
Director of Planning and Research
Northern Essex Community College
Haverhill, MA 01830

Nancy Schuster
Rhode Island Junior College
Warwick, RI 02886

Richard H. Sturgeon
Assistant Director of
Associate Degree Studies
University of Southern Maine
Portland, ME 04103

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
APR 13 1979
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES